United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|---|---------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|--|
| 09/895,557 | 06/29/2001 | Andrew V. Anderson | 42390.P9765X | 6490 | |
| 8791 RLAKELY SO | 7590 01/25/2007 KOLOFF TAYLOR & ZA | EXAMINER | | | |
| 12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD SEVENTH FLOOR LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030 | | | CHANKONG, DOHM | | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | | 2152 | | |
| | | | | | |
| • | • | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE | |
| | | | 01/25/2007 | PAPER | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|-----------------|-----------------|--|
| 09/895,557 | ANDERSON ET AL. | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | |
| Dohm Chankong | 2152 | |

| | Dohm Chankong | 2152 | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence add | ress | | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 10 January 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. | | | | | | | |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods: | the same day as filing a Notice of ving replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in the same of the sam | Appeal. To avoid aba idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C | ice, which FR 41.31; or (3) | | | | |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing | g date of the final rejection. | | | | | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN | | | | | | | |
| TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 79 Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1 136(a). The date | | 36(a) and the appropria | te extension fee | | | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | | | | | | | |
| NOTICE OF APPEAL | " | Cl. 1 2012 1 | | | | | |
| The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of th | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for | | | | | | | |
| appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. | | | | | | | |
| • | | ected claims. | | | | | |
| NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1 | | | (DTOL 004) | | | | |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1 | | mpliant Amendment | (PTOL-324). | | | | |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | | | | | | | |
| Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). | | | | | | | |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is protected. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: | | ll be entered and an e | explanation of | | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-33 and 36-39</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | | | | | |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar | overcome all rejections under appe | al and/or appellant fa | its to provide a | | | | |
| 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | n of the status of the claims after e | ntry is below or attact | ned. | | | | |
| 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but | it does NOT place the application i | n condition for allowa | nce because: | | | | |
| 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). | (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) | | \ - · | | | | |
| 13. | 3 | | 1 | | | | |
| , | BUNJOB JA | ROENCHONWANI Y PATENT EXAMIN | IER | | | | |

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Applicant's proposed amendments add new issues that alter the scope of the invention and therefore further consideration and search is necessary..